

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/110,987 07/07/98 GOCHANOUR G GGG-10003/29

QM22/0608

EXAMINER

TRAN, K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

15

DATE MAILED: 06/08/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/110,987	GOCHANOUR, G. GARY
	Examiner Kim Tran	Art Unit 3724

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 31 May 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_.

4.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_.
5.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
6.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_.
7.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
 

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: 7 and 9.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3, 5, 6 and 8.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_.

9.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ a)has b) has not been approved by the Examiner.
10.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
11.  Other: Please see attachment

**Advisory Action**

1. Applicant's arguments filed on May 31, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant contends that the Finality of the previous Office Action, paper no. 13 is improper. However, the Examiner disagrees. The rejection was in response to the Amendment submitted by the Applicant on January 24, 2001 in which claim 1 was amended to necessitate a new rejection.
3. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, Garr and Stoller, the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it is well-known in the art to provide flexible film or any sheet material with perforations to facilitate in the separation of the sheet material.
4. In response to applicant's argument that Garr is intended for dispensing wrapping paper, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a

process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

5. The Examiner also disagrees with the Applicant's arguments regarding the change in size and material of the base. It would have been obvious and within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to alter Garr to provide a larger base and different material.

For the reasons above, the rejection is deemed proper.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Tran whose telephone number is 703-305-2597.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8-5:30 pm.

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 703-308-2187. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-2597 for regular communications and 703-305-9835 for After Final communications.

8. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

  
knt

June 7, 2001

  
Rinaldi I. Rada  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700